



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service



Mark Twain
National Forest

Region 9



September 2012

DECISION NOTICE

And

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
(FONSI)**

CEDAR CREEK RANGE EAST PROJECT

**Mark Twain National Forest
Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District
Callaway County, Missouri**

Project Number 38281

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-w, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Ave. SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964 (voice or TDD).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION_____	1
II.	DECISION_____	1
III.	REASONS FOR THE DECISION_____	3
IV.	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT_____	5
V.	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE_____	5
VI.	FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT_____	6
VII.	FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS_____	8
VIII.	ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES_____	8
IX.	IMPLEMENTATION DATE_____	9
X.	FUTURE REVIEW OF THE DECISION_____	9
XI.	CONTACT PERSON AND RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL_____	9
XII.	SIGNATURE AND DATE_____	10
APPENDIX A: Mitigation Measures_____		11
APPENDIX B: Table DN2 and Map set including 25 allotment maps_____		13

(Page intentionally left blank)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek (HRCC) Ranger District's primary objective of the Cedar Creek Range East project is to authorize livestock grazing on 25 existing grazing allotments on the HRCC Ranger District. The NFS lands within these 25 allotments have been identified as suitable for domestic livestock grazing in the 2005 Forest Plan. It is Forest Service policy to make forage available to qualified livestock operators from lands suitable for grazing consistent with land management plans (FSM 2203.1; 36 CFR 222.2 (C)).

The Forest Service has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant federal and state laws and regulations. The Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Cedar Creek Range East Project is available for public review at the Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District Office located at 108 S. Sam Houston Blvd., Houston, Missouri and the Mark Twain National Forest website www.fs.usda.gov/goto/mtnf/projects. This document, prepared by an Interdisciplinary (ID) team, discusses the reasons for taking action in the project area. The EA also discusses environmental effects of the proposed treatment. Copies of the EA are available for review upon request.

The EA evaluates rangeland management activities on 25 separate tracts of National Forest System lands totaling approximately 4,712 acres of open pastures through-out the Cedar Creek Ranger District in Callaway County (Please refer to maps in Appendix A). Lands that make up the Cedar Creek Ranger District were all privately owned prior to 1937. In the early 1940's the U.S. Soil Conservation Service purchased the land. In 1953, the land was transferred to the U.S. Forest Service for administration and management. These 25 grazing allotments are on National Forest System Lands and have been managed as a grazing resource since acquisition. The majority of the project areas are generally cool season, open land pastures. Open pasture lands provide edge habitat for a variety of wildlife species including grassland birds, game birds, raptors, small mammals, and white-tailed deer. The 2005 Mark Twain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) designates the area for Management Prescriptions (MP) 1.1 and 2.1.

II. DECISION

The purpose of the Decision Notice in the NEPA process is to identify a selected alternative and provide reasons why that alternative was selected over others considered in the Environmental Assessment (EA).

The Cedar Creek Range East project (EA) evaluated two alternatives in detail and in my opinion provides all the information I need to make a reasonable, informed decision about management in these areas for the next 10 years in a way that complies with the 2005 Mark Twain Forest Plan.

Based on evaluation of alternatives in the EA, supporting documentation, and review of public comments and concerns received during the joint scoping/30-day comment period, I have decided to implement the actions described as **Alternative 2 - Proposed Action**. Alternative 2 allows grazing on the existing 25 allotments in addition to maintaining range infrastructure (i.e. gates, fences), maintaining existing water developments and maintaining these openlands through mowing, hand cutting, seeding, fertilizing, liming, and mechanical treatments of non-

native invasive plants. The attached 25 maps and Table DN2 (Appendix A) illustrate the location of the proposed activities and are hereby made a part of this decision document. I have also decided to implement the mitigation measures found in Appendix B of this document.

Below is a summary of actions to be implemented in Alternative 2 with this decision:

- Grazing Permits and Allotment Management Plans (AMP) will be issued. The AMP's would implement an adaptive management approach (FSH 2209.13, Chapter 90) which will specify the maximum limits or parameters for the appropriate timing, intensity, frequency, and duration for grazing. AMP's with permittees will be in place.
- Maintenance practices may include: mowing, hand-cutting, seeding, fertilizing, liming, mechanical treatments of non-native invasive plants, water source and fence maintenance. The above actions have been variously implemented within the previously existing, grazed, and maintained allotments, and constitute a continuation of ongoing activities; therefore, they are not anticipated to result in additional ground disturbance.
- AMPs will comply with the 2005 Forest Plan and are designed to use cattle grazing to help meet wildlife objectives while minimizing impacts to other resources such as soil, water, and aquatics.
- Monitoring of the allotments will take place annually. Monitoring will be used to determine the need for changes in numbers or duration of use due to reduced forage availability from drought or excess forage from above normal precipitation.

Table DN1 below lists allotments covered under this decision by name, legal description, and location on the District.

Table DN1 – 2011 Range Allotment locations			
RANGE ALLOTMENT NAME	LEGAL DESCRIPTION	COMPARTMENT NUMBER	DISTRICT / COUNTY
101	T46N, R11W Sec. 15, 22	1	Callaway
102	T46N, R11W Sec. 21, 22, 27, 28	1	Callaway
103	T46N, R11W Sec. 27-29, 33	1	Callaway
104	T46N, R11W Sec. 22, 26, 27	1	Callaway
105	T46N, R11W Sec. 26, 27	1	Callaway
106	T46N, R11W Sec. 23	1	Callaway
201	T46N, R11W Sec. 12	2	Callaway
202	T46N, R11W Sec. 12, 13	2	Callaway
203	T46N, R11W Sec. 12, 13	2	Callaway
204	T46N, R11W Sec. 1 T46N, R10W Sec. 7	2	Callaway
205	T46N, R11W Sec. 1, 12	2	Callaway

Table DN1 – 2011 Range Allotment locations			
RANGE ALLOTMENT NAME	LEGAL DESCRIPTION	COMPARTMENT NUMBER	DISTRICT / COUNTY
301	T47N, R11W Sec. 36	3	Callaway
401	T47N, R10W Sec. 27, 28	4	Callaway
501	T47N, R11W Sec. 12 T47N, R10W Sec. 7, 18	5	Callaway
502	T47N, R10W Sec. 7, 8	5	Callaway
503	T47N, R10W Sec. 17, 18	5	Callaway
601	T47N, R10W Sec. 16, 21	6	Callaway
701	T47N, R10W Sec. 31	7	Callaway
702	T47N, R10W Sec. 29, 30	7	Callaway
801	T46N, R10W Sec. 5, 8	8	Callaway
802	T46N, R10W Sec. 5, 8	8	Callaway
901	T46N, R10W Sec. 13, 14, 24	9	Callaway
1001	T46N, R10W Sec. 24 T46N, R10W Sec. 25, 36	10	Callaway
1901	T48N, R10W Sec. 19, 20, 29, 30	19	Callaway
2001	T48N, R10W Sec. 32	20	Callaway

These tracts were all acquired cattle farms that had been developed and maintained for grazing over several generations and contain improved pastures. Heavy year-long grazing allowed tall fescue and other exotic cool season grasses to dominate open lands at the expense of native plant species. A concerted effort has been made over the past to convert many of these areas to warm season pastures, so many pastures have both a warm and cool season component. Since acquisition as National Forest System (NFS) lands, these areas have been managed for open land wildlife habitat with grazing. Without management actions undesirable woody species would dominate these sites, limiting plant and animal diversity. There is local demand for these pastures for grazing activities.

This alternative excludes grazing on Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) to meet desired conditions as stated in the 2005 Forest Plan.

III. REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Decision – Cedar Creek Range East Project

I have chosen Alternative 2, because it was the most responsive to the purpose of and need for action to maintain openlands and work towards the desired condition for Management Area 2.1

while incorporating public and agency concerns. An Integrated Pest Management system will be employed to reduce risk of introduction and effectively control spread of non-native invasive plant species. Habitat for general openland wildlife species will be maintained or enhanced. Riparian Management Zones associated with live streams and alluvial soils have already been excluded from grazing. This selected alternative will provide forage within the capability of sustainable ecosystems and contribute to economic well-being of local and regional communities. Implementation of this decision will be guided by Allotment Management Plans which will be prepared individually for each allotment area to ensure compliance with 2005 Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines.

I am confident, based on my review of the EA, that Alternative 2 will provide the most beneficial effects for maintaining openlands and improving pasture conditions within the Cedar Creek Range East project area.

B. Summary of Environmental Issues and Concerns

The range of alternatives developed by the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) and approved by the Deciding Official demonstrates that an extended effort was made to design alternatives that were responsive to the issues and concerns identified by the IDT during the joint public scoping/30-day comment period. An issue in an EA is defined as: A point of dispute/disagreement over a proposed action based on environmental effects.

The purpose of soliciting comments is to determine where there are any unresolved issues that affect a resource, the proposed action or another alternative. As stated in the EA, only 14 comment letters, telephone comments or e-mails to this project were received. Using the comments from the public, other agencies or tribes, and organizations, the interdisciplinary team determined that no “key issues” were identified from these comments. Since the public involvement process did not generate or identify any unresolved key issues over our proposed action identified on March 6, 2012, no additional alternatives were developed.

Non-key issues considered but already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision

Non-key Issue: Discovery of Cultural Resources during Project Implementation: This project represents formal administrative reauthorization of historically ongoing range management activities. No new activities are being proposed that would have the potential to adversely affect historic properties, as defined by 36 CFR 800.5(b). Should additional activities be proposed at a future date that would have the potential to adversely affect historic properties with the Cedar Creek Range East project, regulatory consultation will be completed prior to implementation of those activities.

C. Alternatives considered and reasons why they were not selected.

Federal agencies are required by NEPA to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives and to briefly discuss the reasons for eliminating any alternatives that were not developed in detail (40 CFR 1502.14). Public comments provided suggestions and information pertaining to management of the allotments. The suggestions brought up non-key

issues, but did not propose any additional alternatives that were already being considered in detail. Some of the concerns were also outside of the scope of this decision. Two alternatives were considered by the IDT.

Alternative 1 – Under this alternative, current and on-going management activities would cease and no new federal management activities would be initiated. No mowing, prescribed fire, noxious weed control, or grazing would be used to maintain open lands at this time.

Rationale – It was not selected because it was not responsive to the purpose and need to maintain open land habitat for wildlife; and improving pasture conditions within the project area. Without vegetation treatments to maintain open lands, the project areas would close in with undesirable trees and shrubs. Current risk of introduction and spread of noxious weeds would continue. Wildlife habitats associated with open lands would diminish over time. Vegetative diversity would decrease.

IV. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The project was initiated with the mailing of a scoping letter to the Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek District NEPA mailing list, adjacent neighbors, Tribal contacts, bidders and permittee holders on March 6, 2012 (351 addresses). This project also appeared on the Mark Twain National Forest Web site as of March 7, 2012. This project has also appeared in the quarterly forest-wide Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) beginning March 12, 2012 through the present. In this project the Responsible Official used the discretion given to them by 36 CFR 215.5(a)(2) in determining the most effective time for publishing the legal notice of the proposed action and opportunity to comment under 36 CFR 215.5 (b). The scoping and 30 day comment period ran concurrently for this project since the nature of this project is low in complexity, is conducted routinely and the environmental effects are highly predictable.

Comments received during the joint scoping/30-day comment period were accepted and evaluated in the development of issues and alternatives to the proposed action. As a result of this formal comment period, (Legal Notice publication, March 11, 2012) the Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District received responses from 14 individuals and organizations. As of the deadline for receiving comments, close of business April 10, 2012, 10 comments were received. All 10 timely comments received were reviewed and evaluated by members of the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) and the deciding official. The four remaining comments, received after April 10, 2012, were also reviewed by members of the IDT. No additional concerns were raised as a result of these four late comments. All comments are addressed in the Response to Comments located in Appendix D of this document. Only one comment in opposition to grazing was brought to the attention of the IDT and the Deciding Official.

Mailing lists of all individuals and organizations that were notified during this project can be found in the Cedar Creek Range East project file.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

I have determined that this project is being conducted in a manner that does not exclude persons from participation in, denying the benefits of, or subjects persons to discrimination because of their racial, ethnic or economic status. The activities carried out by this decision will not have

disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations.

Of the alternatives evaluated in the Cedar Creek Range East project, it is my opinion that none of the alternatives would pose a disproportionately high and adverse impact on the environmental, human health, economic or social fabric in Callaway County.

VI. FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

I have determined, based on the discussion of effects in the Environmental Analysis, and from experience with similar activities, that these actions are not a major federal action, individually or cumulatively, and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. No additional analysis or studies need to be conducted for me to make a determination. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed. This determination is based on the following factors:

1. Both beneficial and adverse impacts were considered in the analysis (EA, Chapter 3). Grazing as proposed will result in removal of renewable herbaceous and some woody vegetation, but will be limited to conservative levels in order to allow for the retention of litter and plant stubble to provide soil cover and wildlife habitat. Adverse effects have been reduced or eliminated through project design. Regular pasture rotations along with light to conservative grazing intensities are predicted to maintain or improve long-term soil and watershed condition.
2. No significant effects on public health and safety were identified. The scope of the grazing authorization is limited to the implementation of managed livestock grazing and the installation and maintenance of structural range facilities. These actions are not expected to present significant hazards to workers or the public. All other activities would be implemented in a manner consistent with the Forest Service Health and Safety Manual.
3. The project will not adversely affect parks, prime farm lands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or other resources considered to have unique characteristics. None of these features are found in these allotments.
4. Based on public participation and the involvement of resource specialists, I believe effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial. This does not mean that the decision to proceed with the project will be acceptable to all people, as some will probably find that their needs and interest are not served by the selected alternative. However, the comments they expressed during the joint scoping/30-day comment period, and considered in the EA, did not disclose any significant adverse effects that would result from the project on the quality of the human environment. Thus, it is my professional judgment that physical, biological, social, and economic issues have been addressed well enough for me to make an informed decision. The proposed actions are similar to other management activities recently implemented on the Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District and on the Mark Twain National Forest; therefore the results are reasonably predictable. (EA, Chapter 3)

Through project design, potential for adverse effects has been minimized to the point where there are few effects to draw controversy. Consideration was given to the long-term beneficial effects of the project. Public involvement efforts (see Public Involvement) did not reveal any significant controversies regarding environmental effects of this proposal and alternatives. Activities and treatments proposed are standard practices on the Forest.

5. There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. Similar projects have been conducted throughout this area for many years enabling us to predict fairly well what the effects of these actions may be. Environmental effects described in the Environmental Assessment, have been analyzed in enough detail to determine predictable results.

6. These actions are similar to other management activities previously implemented and do not set a precedent for other projects that may be proposed to meet the goals and objectives of the 2005 Mark Twain Forest Plan. Any future decisions would need to consider all relevant site-specific information available at that time.

7. There are no known significant cumulative effects between this project and other projects implemented or planned on areas separated from the affected area of this project beyond those evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, for the 2005 Mark Twain Forest Plan. Cumulative effects are evaluated for each resource in the effects section of the environmental assessment, in Chapter 3 of the EA. Cumulative effects areas and timeframes were established for each analysis based on characteristics of resources being analyzed in context with proposed activities. Proposed actions and alternatives are not related to other actions with cumulatively significant impacts and are not a component part of any larger action.

8. Based on the archaeologist's analysis and concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office (August 17, 2012) and because any sites or structures eligible for the National Register of Historic Places will be avoided, there will be no adverse effects on heritage resources, or eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As stated in the August 17, 2012 letter, "We concur with your determination that there will be **no adverse effect** on the condition that should any substantive changes in use or condition not specified in this consultation occur, a formal re-assessment of effect will be initiated. We have no objection to the initiation of project activities."

9. Based on the Biological Evaluation (BE) and Biological Assessment (BA) for the Cedar Creek Range East project, which analyzed impacts to federally-listed Threatened and Endangered Species, gray bat, Indiana bat, and running buffalo clover, all have a "**No Effect**" (NE) determination for the Cedar Creek Range East project. Hine's emerald dragonfly, scaleshell, and spectaclecase occur on the Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District but do not occur or have suitable habitat on the Cedar Creek unit. A "**No Effect**" (NE) determination applies to all of these species. Curtis pearlymussel, pink mucket, Tumbling Creek cavesnail, Ozark hellbender, snuffbox, sheepnose, Mead's milkweed, and Virginia sneezeweed do not occur or have suitable habitat within the boundaries of the Houston/Rolla Ranger District. A "**No Effect**" (NE) determination applies to all of these species.

As stated on page 2 of the BE, "There are no RFSS known to occur in the Cedar Creek Range East project area. The only RFSS that may occur in the Cedar Creek Range East project area are the Bald eagle and the Migrant Loggerhead shrike." On page 4 of the BE a "**No Impact**" determination was made for the bald eagle and Cedar Creek Range East project. On page 6 of the BE a "**May Impact**" determination was made on the Migrant loggerhead shrike and Cedar Creek Range East project. Those RFSS species not likely to occur in the Cedar Creek Range East project area due to a lack of suitable habitat received a "No Impact" (NI) determination.

10. The Proposed Action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law, or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The Environmental Assessment displays compliance with the Forest Plan, Environmental Protection Agency, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and Missouri State and National Historic Preservation Act. Proposed actions and alternatives are consistent with the *National Environmental Policy Act*, *National Forest Management Act*, *the Endangered Species Act*, *Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act*, *Executive Order 12898*, *National Historic Preservation Act*, *Migratory Bird Treaty Act*, and other laws, regulation, and policy.

11. The best available and most current scientific information was taken into account and appropriately evaluated and applied were appropriate in this analysis.

VII. FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

It is my finding that the actions of this decision comply with the requirements of the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and the 2005 Mark Twain National Forest Land and Resource Plan. I have reviewed the 2005 Forest Plan and determined that this decision is consistent with the Forest Plan's goals and objectives. The action in this project complies fully with the 2005 Forest Plan Chapter 3, Management Direction for Management Prescriptions 1.1 and 2.1, and the Forestwide Standards and Guidelines (2005 Forest Plan, Chapter 2). I have also reviewed Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Effects, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the 2005 Mark Twain Forest Plan, and conclude that the environmental effects associated with this project are consistent with those described in the FEIS. This decision is subject to the Planning Rule and FSM 1920 and 1922.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES

This decision is subject to appeal in accordance with regulations at 36 CFR 215. Individuals or organizations that provided comments or otherwise expressed interest in the proposed action during the March 2012 comment period may appeal. Appeals, including attachments, must be in writing, consistent with 36 CFR 215.14 and filed (postmarked) within 45 days of the date of legal notice of this decision in the *Fulton Sun* newspaper, Fulton, Missouri. This publication date is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an appeal. Those wishing to appeal this decision should not rely on dates or timeframes provided by any other source.

Appeals must be filed (regular mail, email, fax, hand-delivery, or express delivery) at the following address:

Teresa Chase, Appeal Deciding Officer (ADO)
ATTN: Appeals and Litigation
USDA Forest Service, Eastern Region
626 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202

or Email: appeals-eastern-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Subject: Cedar Creek Range East Project

or Fax; 414-944-3963 **ATTN:** Appeal Deciding Officer, USDA Forest Service, Eastern Region

Normal business hours (for hand-delivered appeals) are 7:30 am – 4: 00 pm, Mon-Fri. Electronic appeals should be in TXT, RTF, DOC, PDF, or other Microsoft Office-compatible formats. Appeals must meet the content requirements of 36 CFR 215.14.

The allotment permittee may choose to appeal the decision under the regulations listed at 36 CFR 251, Subpart C or 36 CFR 215, but not both. An appeal by the permittee under the 36 CFR 251 regulations must be filed simultaneously with the Mark Twain National Forest Supervisor *Teresa Chase* (see address above) and the Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek District Ranger, Kimberly Bittle, 108 S. Sam Houston Blvd., Houston, MO 65483 within 45 days of the date of publication of legal notice in the *Fulton Sun*.

IX. IMPLEMENTATION DATE

If no appeal is received, implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, 5 days from the close of the appeal filing period. If we receive an appeal, implementation may not occur for 15 days following the date of the appeal deposition. (36 CFR 215.9)

X. FUTURE REVIEW OF THE DECISION

In accordance with Forest Service Handbook direction [FSH 1909.15(18) and 2209.13(96)], an interdisciplinary review of the decision will occur within 10 years, or sooner if conditions warrant. If this review indicates that management is meeting standards and achieving desired condition, the initial management activities will be allowed to continue. If monitoring demonstrates that objectives are not being met and management options beyond the scope of the analysis are warranted, or if new information demonstrates significant effects not previously considered, a new proposed action will be developed and further analysis under NEPA will occur.

XI. CONTACT PERSON AND RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL

Kimberly Bittle, Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek District Ranger, is the responsible official for the Cedar Creek Range East Project EA. Further information about this decision can be obtained several ways:

- Telephone: Contact, Mark Hamel Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District Office during business hours (8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. CST) at (573) 341-7443.
- In writing: Contact, Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District, 108 S. Sam Houston Blvd., Houston, MO 65483 Attention: Mark Hamel
- Facsimile requests: Address to: Mark Hamel, Integrated Resource Analyst at: (573) 364-6844.
- E-mail requests: comments-eastern-mark-twain-cedar-ck@fs.fed.us.

Please Specify “Cedar Creek Range East Project #38281” on your subject line.

XII. SIGNATURE AND DATE

/s/ Kimberly Bittle
KIMBERLY BITTLE
District Ranger
Houston/Rolla/Cedar Creek Ranger District

09/07/2012
Date

APPENDIX A
MITIGATION MEASURES

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR1: Discovery of Cultural Resources during Project Implementation

Although the cultural resources surveys completed for this project are designed to locate all archaeological sites and site components that might be eligible for the National Register, such sites and site components may go undetected for a variety of reasons. Should any previously unrecorded cultural resources be discovered during project implementation, activities that may be affecting that resource will be halted immediately; the resource will be evaluated by a professional archaeologist; and consultation will be initiated with the SHPO, as well as with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, if required, to determine appropriate actions for protecting the resource and for mitigating any adverse effects on the resource. Project activities at that locale will not be resumed until the resource is adequately protected and until agreed-upon mitigation measures are implemented with SHPO approval.

APPENDIX B

Table DN2: Allotments and Map Set

Table DN2: 2012 Cedar Creek Allotments

Allotment Name	Number of pastures	Capable Grazing Acres	Livestock Number and Class (Animal Units-AU)		Season of Use/(Days)	Permitted Animal Unit Months (AUM's)
			Number	Class		
101	4	95	30	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	207
102	4	226	70	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	556
103	5	145	46	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	365
104	4	138	44	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	349
105	3	57	16	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	127
106	1	36	12	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	72
201	2	107	33	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	262
202	5	176	35	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	278
203	3	120	27	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	214
204	3	117	20	Cow/Calf	7/1 – 8/15(46)	214
205	1	30	27	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	30
301	1	25	17	Cow/Calf	5/15 – 8/31(109)	80
401	4	189	45	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	357
501	3	116	30	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	238
502	3	174	52	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	413
503	3	147	40	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	318
601	4	159	40	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	318
701	2	48	12	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	95
702	5	228	65	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	516
801	3	119	41	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	326
802	6	186	55	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	437
901	6	268	60	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	477
1001	5	202	60	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	477
1901	6	206	54	Cow/Calf	4/14 – 10/13(183)	429
2001	1	24	37	Heifers inc. Bull	6/1 – 6/30(30)	48